

If you look simply at line 5 of Schedule A, you see where people who pay income taxes to their State can deduct that, and you will see there is no line for Washington State taxpayers or taxpayers in similar States to deduct their sales tax.

This is not a complicated bill. It is a very simple bill, it is a fair bill and I would urge my colleagues to support it. We have an obligation to treat citizens fairly at the Federal level. That is why I am here, to fight for simple fairness.

This is the second time I have stood here in this well in less than a month to sponsor legislation that will protect our citizens from being subjected to unfair taxation. I will come back to the well of this House again and again until we achieve that standard.

I hope that my colleagues will see the wisdom of this fair proposal and that we can take swift action to restore this common-sense option. I invite them to join me in this effort for the simple reason that it is the right thing to do.

ON NATIONAL SECURITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NETHERCUTT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Mr. Speaker, I rise this afternoon out of concern for the State of America's national security. I do not want to speak directly to the ongoing operations in Kosovo today, although I am deeply troubled by the enormous uncertainties that seem to be the consequence of a poorly planned policy. Instead, I want to address the consequences of Kosovo on the U.S. military presence worldwide. I believe we are facing a period of unacceptable risk.

Our armed forces are spread across the globe, from South Korea to Latin America. We are engaged in areas that are clearly essential to American security and in areas that are clearly tangential to our security. We are engaged in what are essentially two air wars on two continents at the same time to which we are asking combat engineers to devote themselves to building roads and bridges. We are deterring invasion and we are garrisoning in support of peace agreements.

What we must consider is whether we are doing too much and we spread too thin. Historically we have been warned of the dangers of "imperial overstretch." Unfortunately, I have fears that we are reaching such a point today. I do not want to call for retrenchment or retreat, but we must ask if we have gone too far and if we have asked too much of the armed forces. If we have, it is the job of Congress and the administration to work together to identify solutions.

In 1997, the Quadrennial Defense Review reaffirmed the requirement that

the U.S. must be prepared to fight two nearly simultaneously major theater wars while also staying ready for lesser contingencies. I have argued in Congress that the available funding for the Department of Defense has been inadequate to meet those requirements.

When the United States fought the 1991 Persian Gulf War, we had about 3.2 million soldiers in the active and reserve components. Ten years later, today, we have 900,000 fewer men and women in uniform.

□ 1645

The Army, which has been tasked with the responsibility of maintaining the majority of our overseas presence, has seen its active duty end strength fall by some 40 percent since 1991. Today we maintain as a matter of national strategy 100,000 troops in Asia and another 100,000 troops in Europe. We now have more than 20,000 personnel actively engaged in Operation Allied Force, and nearly 40,000 personnel are engaged in an astonishing 20 other operations around the world today, and the situation today varies only slightly from the breakneck operational pace since the Persian Gulf War. A recent Congressional Research Service report counts 28 different contingency operations from 1991 until now at a cost of nearly \$18 billion. The President has committed our resources to these operations.

The Air Mobility Command Base in my hometown of Spokane at Fairchild is an example of this extraordinary intensive operational tempo. Fairchild is kept very busy supporting KC-135 aerial refueling tankers from 16 different locations around the world. Ninety-seven percent of the total crew force from the 92nd Airlift Wing is deployed today.

We are trying to maintain this level of international presence with increasingly ancient equipment. The KC-135's based at Fairchild have an average age of 37 years. There is no planning for replacement largely because there are no funds available. The B-52s, which were also once based at Fairchild, are slightly older, yet the Air Force intends to keep them in the inventory until 2040. No replacement is in sight, another victim of dramatically smaller defense budgets. Despite the intensive operational pace, defense spending has fallen 30 percent from Fiscal Year 1991 levels and 40 percent from Fiscal Year 1985 levels.

As we overcommit our forces to tangential operations around the globe, the risk increases. Troops deployed in Haiti cannot immediately support missions in Korea, and troops trained to keep the peace in Bosnia are not combat ready if they are called upon to defend Kuwait.

A rubber band can only be stretched so far before it breaks, and I fear we are nearing that point. Mr. Milosevic

called the Clinton administration's bluff in Kosovo, and 3 weeks ago American forces were pitched into a war we had not planned for and lacked the resources to immediately support. What would formerly have been considered a lesser contingency has now tied down a significant number of our conventional combat power.

General Clark's recent request for reinforcements is for a total of 800 planes in the region, tying up nearly seven combat air wings out of a total of 20 in Europe. Our most important assets are committed. We have heavily taxed our available airlift. It is all tied up with supporting our forces and the refugees in Kosovo. There is no carrier battle group providing coverage in Northeast Asia because of the need to support the Balkan mission. We have nearly expended all available air launched cruise missiles, and both the Air Force and the Navy have submitted emergency requests to replenish depleted stores.

Now it looks like the President is going to be calling up the Reserves to support this mission, the first call-up since the Persian Gulf War. Can we sustain this pace? It is very questionable. We must fund it if we are going to sustain it.

The services have presented the National Security Appropriations Subcommittee a list of unfunded requirements that amounts to over \$7 million a year, and these funds are needed just to meet the military's most critical needs, not considering any of the shortfalls that have emerged in the last few weeks. This is a serious situation and supplemental funding should include not just the costs of the operation, but also the critical funds that the military needs to step back from the brink to which it has been pushed. We must reverse continued deterioration of our Armed Forces.

FEDERAL EMPLOYEES GROUP LONG-TERM CARE INSURANCE ACT OF 1999

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, the provision of long-term care insurance coverage to Federal employees is an important priority for me as ranking member of the Subcommittee on Civil Service. On January 6, I introduced H.R. 110, the Federal Employees Group Long-Term Care Insurance Act of 1999. My bill is one of four elements of the comprehensive long-term care package proposed earlier this year by President Clinton.

H.R. 110 would authorize the Office of Personnel Management to purchase a policy or policies from one or more qualified private sector contractors to make long-term care insurance available to Federal employees, retirees and eligible family members at group rates. Coverage would be paid for entirely by those who elect it.